

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed February 25, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to March 25, 2005. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 12, 2004. Although an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 from the IDS was not attached to an Official Action, the Applicants note that such copy appears in the Image File Wrapper (IFW).

However, the Applicants have not received acknowledgment of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 5, 2001. IFW also does not appear to contain a copy of an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 associated with the IDS. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of the IDS filed October 5, 2001.

A further IDS is submitted herewith and consideration of this IDS is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-144 are pending in the present application. Independent claims 1, 10, 37, 46, 73, 82, 109 and 118 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and claims 1-144 have been amended to correct minor matters of form. Claims 19-36, 55-72, 91-108 and 127-144 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 1-18, 37-54, 73-90 and 109-126 are currently elected, of which claims 1, 10, 37, 46, 73, 82, 109 and 118 are independent, and claims 1 and 37 are generic. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-18, 37-54, 73-90 and 109-126 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,559,821 to Ichikawa et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,121,760 to Marshall et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that

COPY

a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 1, 10, 37, 46, 73, 82, 109 and 118 have been amended to recite a current source in a source signal line driving circuit for supplying a current to a level shifter, which is supported in the specification, for example, by page 16, line 23, to page 17, line 13. Ichikawa and Marshall, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Since Ichikawa and Marshall do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration

COPY

and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789

COPY